IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No. 5488 of 1987

For Approval and Signature:

HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.A.PUJ

==========

1	Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2	To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3	Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ?
4	Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the constitution of India, 1950 or any order made thereunder ?
5	Whether it is to be circulated to the civil judge ?

==========

K N MATWANI - Petitioner
Versus
KANDLA PORT TRUST & 2 - Respondent(s)

==========

Appearance :
NOTICE SERVED for Petitioner.
MR ALPESH RAJPURIYA for Respondents.

==========

CORAM : HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.A.PUJ

Date : 13/12/2005

ORAL JUDGMENT

1.The petitioner has filed this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for direction to the respondent authorities to expunge the adverse entries made in the Confidential reports of the petitioner for the years 1972, 1982, 1983 and 1984 and to treat those remarks as non-est in the eye of law. The petitioner has also prayed for the directions to the respondents to confer upon the petitioner all benefits as if those remarks did not at all exist in the Confidential Reports of the petitioner from the due date with all other consequential benefits.

2.The petition was admitted on 07.12.1989. While issuing the rule, this Court has directed the office that this petition be heard along with Special Civil Application No. 705 of 1987 filed by the present petitioner.

3.The petition was filed by the learned advocate on behalf of the petitioner who was later on elevated to the bench of this Court. Thereafter, fresh notice was issued to the petitioner and the same was duly served on the petitioner. The petitioner has, however, not filed any appearance thereafter. It, therefore, appears to the Court that the petitioner is not interested in prosecuting this matter. The present petition is, therefore, disposed of for want of prosecution. It is made clear that the Court has not gone into the merits of the matter and not adjudicated the issues raised in the present petition. It is, therefore, open for the petitioner to approach this Court in case of any difficulty or if the need so arises in future.

4.Subject to the aforesaid direction and

observation, this petition is accordingly disposed of. Rule discharged without any order as to costs.

[K.A. PUJ, J.]

S*avariya*